arXiv:1207.0271v1 [cs.DS] 2 Jul 2012

# Approximating Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem With Uncertainty

June 14, 2012

Shuxin Cai[1] Wenguo Yang[2] Yaohua Tang[1]

[1]College of Engineering and Information Technology, Graduate University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China.
[2]School of Mathematical Sciences, Graduate University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China.

## Abstract

We first show that a better analysis of the algorithm for *The Two-Sage Stochastic Facility Location Problem* from Srinivasan [13] and the algorithm for *The Robust Fault Tolerant Facility Location Problem* from Byrka et al [3] can render improved approximation factors of 2.206 and $\alpha + 4$ where $\alpha$ is the maximum number an adversary can close, respectively, and which are the best ratios so far.

We then present new models for the soft-capacitated facility location problem with uncertainty and design constant factor approximation algorithms to solve them. We devise the stochastic and robust approaches to handle the uncertainty incorporated into the original model. Explicitly, in this paper we propose two new problem, named *The 2-Stage Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem* and *The Robust Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem* respectively, and present constant factor approximation algorithms for them both. Our method uses reductions between facility location problems and linear-cost models, the randomized thresholding technique of Srinivasan [13] and the filtering and clustering technique of Byrka et al [3].

**Keywords**: Facility Location, Approximation Algorithm, 2-Stage, Robust, Stochastic, Soft-Capacitated

---

[3] Emails: cai_shuxin@hotmail.com, yangwg@gucas.ac.cn.

[4] This work is partly supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No:71171189No:90924008 No:91024031 and No:10831006) and Knowledge Innovation Program (No: kjcx-yw-s7) of the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

# 1 Introduction

Given two discrete sets of clients and candidate locations where to build facilities, in the classic *Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem* (UFL) we are to pick some locations and build facilities on them so that each client can connect itself to a facility, in order to minimize the building and connection cost. Such models capture some essence of facility location problems, but failed to deal with the uncertainty in decision making that is very common in realistic settings.

Usually facility location decisions are expensive and hard to reverse, and their influence lasts a long time. Any of the parameters of the problems, e.g. costs, demands, distances, may change greatly during the time when design decisions are in effect. Further, because of poor measurements or to tasks inherent in the modeling process such as aggregating demands points and choosing a distance norm, parameter estimates may also be inaccurate due to . For the sake of this, researchers have been developing models for facility location under uncertainty for several decades. (see [12] for a survey)

One approach to handle the uncertainty is the study of *The 2-Stage Stochastic Facility Location Problem*(TSFL)(see [3], [13], [16], [15]). In which, there are two stages of decision making and a set of scenarios which are subsets of the set of all clients, each happening with a prefixed probability. Upon the first stage, we open facilities without the specific knowledge of clients; then in the second stage the realized scenario enters, we are allowed to open additional facilities but with much higher opening cost, and connect the clients to the opened facilities. The aim is to minimize the facility opening cost of first stage plus the expected cost incurred in the second stage. This problem is introduced by Swamy and Shmoys [16]. The approximation ratio is then improved by Srinivasan [13] to 2.369. Byrka etc. [3] use the techniques they developed for uncapacitated facility location problems (UFL) to obtain a 2.298-approximation algorithm. We refines the approach of Srinivasan [13] and further improve the approximation factor to 2.206. There is another trend of analysis that derives *per-scenario* bound for TSFL. Swamy [15] obtains a 3.378 bound and is improved by Srinivasan [13] to 3.25. Then Byrka et al [3] further improves the bound to 2.496. However, we will show that their algorithm is in fact of ratio 2.425.

*The Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem* (SCFL) is similar to the UFL except there is a capacity $u_i$ associated with each facility $i$, which means if we want this facility to serve $k$ clients, we have to open it $\lceil k/u_i \rceil$ times at a cost of $\lceil k/u_i \rceil f_i$. This problem is also known as *facility location problem with integer decision variables* in the operations research literature (see [2]). Chudak and Shmoys [6] gave a 3-approximation algorithm for SCFL with uniform capacities using LP rounding. For non-uniform capacities, Jain and Vazirani [8] showed how to reduce this problem to the UFL, and by solving the UFL through a primal-dual algorithm, they obtained a 4-algorithm. A local search algorithm proposed by Arya et al [1] had an approximation ratio 3.72. Following the approach of Jain and Vazirani [8], Jain et al [7] showed that the SCFL can be solved within a factor of 3. This result was further improved by Mahdian et al [11] to a 2.89-approximation algorithm for SCFL. Later they present a 2-approximation algorithm for the same problem in [10], achieving the integrality gap of the natural LP relaxation of the problem. This is the best result so far. The main idea of their approach is to consider algorithms and reductions that have separate approximation ratios for facility and connection cost. There is a more general version of SCFL called *The Concave Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem* (CSCFL), where the cost function is concave on the number of copies of facilities opened (see [10]).

In this paper we extend the SCFL and introduce *The 2-Stage Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem*(TSSCFL). TSSCFL is defined the same as TSFL except that there is a soft capacity associated with each facility. By reducing it to *The 2-Stage Linear-Cost Facility Location Problem*(TSLCFL), we are able to approximate TSSCFL within constant factor in polynomial time. The 2-Stage Linear-Cost Facility Location Problem is defined similarly as TSFL except now the cost function is linear on the number of clients each facility serves. More precisely, here $f_i^I = a_i^1 k + b_i^1$ and $f_i^A = a_i^2 k + b_i^2$, where $f_i^I$ is the facility opening cost of the first stage and $f_i^A$ the second stage when scenario $A$ happens. $a_i^1$ and $b_i^1$ are constants, called *marginal* and *setup* costs respectively, for the first stage. $a_i^2$ and $b_i^2$ are marginal and setup costs respectively, for the second stage. $k$ is the number of clients a facility serves. This problem is also an extension of *The Linear-Cost Facility Location Problem* (cf. [10]). Analogously, we also introduce *The 2-Stage Concave Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem*(TSCSCFL) and again provide a constant factor approximation algorithm for it using the same techniques.

Another way to represent the uncertainty in facility location problems is to model them as robust problems. *The Robust Fault-Tolerant Facility Location Problem*(RFTFL) is introduced by Chechik and Peleg [5], who present approximation algorithms of ratio 6.5 and $1.5 + 7.5\alpha$ for the cases of only 1 facility can fail and up to $\alpha$ facilities can fail respectively. In RFTFL, one has to choose a set of facilities that are in a sense robust: i.e., in case of failure of up to $\alpha$ of the opened facilities, where $\alpha$ is viewed as a constant, the cost of connecting clients to the facilities that did not fail should be small. More precisely, we bound the total facility opening cost plus a worst case client connection cost. Byrka et al [3] improve the approximation ratio to $\alpha + 5 + 4/\alpha$. For the case of single failure, Li et al [9] further improve the approximation ratio to 5.236. We show that a better analysis of the algorithm from Byrka et al [3] yields a approximation ratio $\alpha + 4$.

In this paper we present a new problem named *The Robust Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem*(RSCFL), in which we have to further satisfy the capacity constraint of each facility. *The Robust Linear Cost Facility Location Problem*(RLCFL) is defined analogously as above. Again we use the reduction between them and devise a constant factor approximation algorithm.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the formal definitions and reduction between different problems. In Section 3 and Section 4 we provide and analyze approximation algorithms for stochastic and robust version of the problems respectively. We make concluding remarks in Section 5. The clients in all problems considered here have only unit demands. It is easy to generalize the unit-demand models to the case of arbitrary demands without loss in approximation guarantee. Each client is connected to only one facility. All the distances satisfy the triangle inequality.

## 2 Definition and Reduction

In *The 2-Stage Stochastic Facility Location Problem*(TSFL), we are given a graph $G$, a discrete set of clients $\mathcal{D}$, a discrete set of candidate locations $\mathcal{F}$ where to build facilities, two decision stages, and a polynomial number of scenarios each with a prefixed probability $p_A$ for scenario $A$ ($A$ essentially represents a subset of clients). Upon the first stage, we open facilities without the specific knowledge of clients, with facility opening cost $f_i^I$ for each facility $i$; then in the second stage the realized scenario $A$ enters (a subset of clients appear), we are allowed to open additional facilities but with much higher opening cost $f_i^A$. Finally connect each client to the nearest opened facility. The aim is to minimize the facility opening cost of first stage and the expected cost incurred in the second stage.

*The 2-Stage Linear-Cost Facility Location Problem*(TSLCFL) is a special case of TSFL, where the facilities opened in two stages incur linear costs. The first stage facility opening cost is $f_i^I = a_i^I k + b_i^I$ for each facility $i$. $a_i^I$ and $b_i^I$ are the constant marginal cost and setup cost of first stage, respectively, and $k$ the number of clients facility $i$ serves. The second stage facility opening cost $f_i^A = a_i^A k + b_i^A$, where $a_i^A$ and $b_i^A$ are the constant marginal cost and setup cost of second stage for scenario $A$, respectively.

*The 2-Stage Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem*(TSSCFL) is a special case of TSFL, where there is a capacity $u_i$ associated with each facility $i$. If a facility is to serve $k$ clients, we have to open it $\lceil k/u_i \rceil$ times at a cost of $\lceil k/u_i \rceil f_i$. *The 2-Stage Concave Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem* (TSCSCFL) is a generalized case of TSSCFL, where the cost function is $g_i(\lceil k/u_i \rceil)$ for facility $i$. Here $g(\cdot)$ is a concave function, $k$ the number of clients a facility serves, $u_i$ the capacity of facility $i$.

In *The Robust Fault Tolerant Facility Location Problem*(RFTFL), we are given a graph $G$, two discrete sets of clients $\mathcal{D}$, a discrete set of candidate locations $\mathcal{F}$ where to build facilities, and an adversary who can close up to $\alpha$ facilities after opening and assignment. Any client whose serving facility is closed by adversary has to be reassigned to the nearest facility that is still open. The aim is to minimize the sum of facility opening cost, the connection cost, and the increment of the reassignment cost of the worst case.

*The Robust Linear-Cost Facility Location Problem*(RLCFL) is a special case of RFTFL, where the facility opening cost is $f_i = a_i k + b_i$ for each facility $i$. $a_i$ and $b_i$ are the constant marginal cost and setup cost of first stage, respectively, and $k$ the number of clients facility $i$ serves.

*The Robust Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem*(RSCFL) is special case of RFTFL, where there is a capacity $u_i$ associated with each facility $i$. If a facility is to serve $k$ clients, we have to open it $\lceil k/u_i \rceil$ times at a cost of $\lceil k/u_i \rceil f_i$. *The Concave Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem* (CSCFL) is a generalized case of TSSCFL, where the cost function is $g_i(\lceil k/u_i \rceil)$. Here $g_i(\cdot)$ is a concave function, $k$ the number of clients a facility serves, $u_i$ the capacity of facility $i$.

In describing the results of approximating facility location problems, we usually use the notion of *bifactor* approximation ratio . An algorithm is called a $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithm for the facility location problems if for every instance $\mathcal{I}$ of the problem and for every solution $SOL$ for $\mathcal{I}$ with facility cost $F_{SOL}$ and connection cost $C_{SOL}$, the cost of the solution found by the algorithm is at most $\gamma_f F_{SOL} + \gamma_c C_{SOL}$.

We define *reduction* between facility location problems as follows, which is first introduced in [10]. A reduction from a facility location problem $\mathcal{A}$ to another facility location problem $\mathcal{B}$ is a procedure $R$ that maps every instance $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ to an instance $R(\mathcal{I})$ of $\mathcal{B}$. This procedure is called a $(\sigma_f, \sigma_c)$-reduction if the following conditions hold.

- For any instance $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and any feasible solution for $\mathcal{I}$ with facility cost $F^*_{\mathcal{A}}$ and connection cost $C^*_{\mathcal{A}}$, there is a corresponding solution for the instance $R(\mathcal{I})$ with facility cost $F^*_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \sigma_f F^*_{\mathcal{A}}$ and connection cost $C^*_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \sigma_c C^*_{\mathcal{A}}$.
- For any feasible solution for the instance $R(\mathcal{I})$, there is a corresponding feasible solution for $\mathcal{I}$ whose total cost is at most as much as the total cost of the original solution for $R(\mathcal{I})$.

So we have

**Lemma 1** (Mahdian et al [10])**.** *If there is a $(\sigma_f, \sigma_c)$-reduction from a facility location problem $\mathcal{A}$ to another facility location problem $\mathcal{B}$, and a $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithm for $\mathcal{B}$, then there is a $(\gamma_f\sigma_f, \gamma_c\sigma_c)$-approximation algorithm for $\mathcal{A}$.*

*Proof.* For a reduction $R(\mathcal{I})$ of an instance $\mathcal{I}$ of problem $\mathcal{A}$, run the $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithm for $\mathcal{B}$ on $R(\mathcal{I})$, and output the solution for $\mathcal{I}$. Let $SOL$ be an arbitrary solution for $\mathcal{I}$, $ALG$ be the solution that the above algorithm finds, and $F^*_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $C^*_{\mathcal{P}}$ ($F^{ALG}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $C^{ALG}_{\mathcal{P}}$, respectively) denote the facility and connection costs of $SOL$ ($ALG$, respectively) when viewed as a solution for the problem $\mathcal{P}$ ($\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$). By the definition of $(\sigma_f, \sigma_c)$-reductions and $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithms we have

$$F^{ALG}_{\mathcal{A}} + C^{ALG}_{\mathcal{A}} \leq F^{ALG}_{\mathcal{B}} + C^{ALG}_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \gamma_f F^*_{\mathcal{B}} + \gamma_c C^*_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \gamma_f\sigma_f F^*_{\mathcal{A}} + \gamma_c\sigma_c C^*_{\mathcal{A}} \tag{1}$$

□

We now build the reduction between facility location problems. We define the a variant of TSFL as *The 2-Stage Stochastic Facility Location Problem With Different Connection Cost*(TSFLD), where the costs incurred in connecting clients to facilities opened in the first and second stage are different.

**Lemma 2.** *We have a $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithm for $\mathfrak{I}$ of TSLCFL, if there is $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithm for $\mathfrak{I}$' of TSFLD.*

*Proof.* For any instance $\mathfrak{I}$ of TSLCFL, we transform it to a new instance $\mathfrak{I}$' of TSFLD with the first stage facility cost $f^I_i = b^I_i$, the second stage facility cost $f^A_i = b^A_i$, and the connection cost $c^1_{ij} = a^I_i + c_{ij}$ when client $j$ is connected to facility $i$ opened in the first stage, $c^2_{ij} = a^A_i + c_{ij}$ the second stage. □

**Lemma 3.** *We have a $(2\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithm for $\mathfrak{I}$ of TSSCFL, if there is $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithm for $\mathfrak{I}$' of TSLCFL.*

*Proof.* For any instance $\mathfrak{I}$ of TSSCFL, we construct an instance $\mathfrak{I}$' of TSLCFL. The connection cost remain the same. The facility cost of facility $i$ is changed to $(1 + \frac{k-1}{u_i})f_i$ and $(1 + \frac{k-1}{u_i})f^A_i$ if $k \geq 1$ and 0 if $k = 0$. Thus for every $k \geq 1$, $\lceil \frac{k}{u_i} \rceil \leq 1 + \frac{k-1}{u_i} \leq 2 \cdot \lceil \frac{k}{u_i} \rceil$. Therefore it is a $(2, 1)$-reduction. □

**Lemma 4.** *We have a $(\max_{i\in\mathcal{F}} \frac{g_i(2)}{g_i(1)}\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithm for $\mathfrak{I}$ of TSCSCFL, if there is $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$-approximation algorithm for $\mathfrak{I}$' of TSLCFL.*

The proof of the above lemma is very much like the one to Theorem 11 in [11] and is omitted here.

With analogous analysis, we can make similar arguments in the robust case.

**Lemma 5.** *We have a* $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$*-approximation algorithm for* $\mathfrak{I}$ *of RLCFL, if there is* $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$*-approximation algorithm for* $\mathfrak{I}$*' of RFTFL.*

**Lemma 6.** *We have a* $(2\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$*-approximation algorithm for* $\mathfrak{I}$ *of RSCFL, if there is* $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$*-approximation algorithm for* $\mathfrak{I}$*' of RLCFL.*

**Lemma 7.** *We have a* $(\max_{i\in\mathcal{F}} \frac{g_i(2)}{g_i(1)}\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$*-approximation algorithm for* $\mathfrak{I}$ *of RC-SCFL, if there is* $(\gamma_f, \gamma_c)$*-approximation algorithm for* $\mathfrak{I}$*' of RLCFL.*

## 3 The 2-Stage Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem

We first solve TSFLD via an approximation algorithm using the technique of randomized thresholding from [13]. Note that now we have different connection costs referred to the first and second stage.

Let $x^1_{A,ij} = min\{x_{A,ij}, y_i\}$ and $x^2_{A,ij} = x_{A,ij} - x^1_{A,ij}$. $c_{ij}$ is the cost of connecting client $j$ to $i$. $y_i$ and $y_{A,i}$ are the extents to which facility $i$ is opened in first stage and in second stage under scenario $A$, respectively. $x_{A,ij}$ is the extent to which $j$ is connected to $i$ in scenario $A$. We have the following program for TSFLD. Note that it is not a linear program, but since the only non-linear element in the objective function is the *min* term, it can be easily transformed to a linear program, thus can be solved in polynomial time.

$$\begin{aligned} Minimize \sum_{i\in\mathcal{F}} f^I_i y_i + \sum_A p_A(\sum_i f^A_i y_{A,i} + \sum_{j\in A}\sum_i (c^1_{ij}x^1_{A,ij} + c^2_{ij}x^2_{A,ij})) & \\ s.\ t.\ \sum_i x_{A,ij} \geq 1 & \qquad \forall A\ \forall j \in A; \\ x_{A,ij} \leq y_i + y_{A,i} & \qquad \forall i\ \forall A\ \forall j \in A; \\ x_{A,ij}, y_i, y_{A,i} \geq 0 & \qquad \forall i\ \forall A\ \forall j \in A. \end{aligned}$$

We solve the program for TSFLD, and still denote the optimal solution $x_{A,ij}$, $y_i$ and $y_{A,ij}$. We then split facilities to obtain a *complete* instance, i.e. $x_{A,ij} = y_i + y_{A,i}$ for every scenario $A$, facility $i$ and client $j$, with the same facility opening and connection cost. The technique of splitting is widely used in designing LP rounding approximation algorithms for facility location problems. Details can be found explicitly in [14].

Denote $x^{(1)}_{A,ij} = min\{x_{A,ij}, y_i\}$ and $x^{(2)}_{A,ij} = x_{A,ij} - x^{(1)}_{A,ij}$. If $j \in A$ and $x_{A,ij} = 0$, define $x^{(1)}_{A,ij} = x^{(2)}_{A,ij} = 0$. Note that $x^{(1)}_{A,ij} = y_i$ and $x^{(2)}_{A,ij} = y_{A,i}$.

Here we adopt the same distribution as in [13] to distinguish clients between those to be served in the first stage and those in the second stage.

- with probability $\alpha/(1-\alpha)$, let $Z = 1/2$;
- with probability $(1-2\alpha)/(1-\alpha)$, pick $Z$ from $[\alpha, 1-\alpha]$ via the uniform distribution.

where $0 < \alpha < 0.5$ is a constant fixed later.

Let $r^1_{A,j}$ be the extent to which $(j, A)$ is served in first stage, for every pair $(j, A)$, i.e.

$$r^1_{A,j} = \sum_i x^{(1)}_{A,ij}; \tag{2}$$

we select pair $(j, A)$ in the first stage if and only if

$$Z \leq r^1_{A,j}. \tag{3}$$

Otherwise we select $(j, A)$ in the second stage. For the first stage, construct a instance $\mathcal{I}$ with each selected pair $(j, A)$ having demand $p_A$ and each facility $i$ having cost $f_i^I$. Here instead of solving the instance using the (1.11,1.78)-algorithm of [7] for UFL as in [13], we adopt the (1,2)-algorithm from [11] (See Theorem A in [11] for details), for the sake of further exploiting the asymmetry property of the algorithm. For the second stage, construct a instance $\mathcal{I}_A$ with a unit demand client for each $j \in A$ such that $(j, A)$ was not selected in first stage; each facility $i$ has cost $f_i^A$. Again we use the same UFL algorithm to solve it.

It is easy to know we have obtained a feasible solution. To analyze the expected cost of this solution, we start by constructing feasible fractional solutions for instance $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{I}_A$. Let us first construct a feasible fractional solution $(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ for the first stage instance $\mathcal{I}$: $\hat{y}_i = min\{y_i/Z, 1\}$ for all $i$, and $\hat{x}_{A,ij} = x^{(1)}_{A,ij}/r^1_{A,j}$ for all selected $(j, A)$ and all $i$. It is feasible since $r^1_{A,j} \geq Z$. Thus, letting $S_{j,A}$ be the indicator variable for $(j, A)$ being selected and note that each selected $(j, A)$ has demand $p_A$ in $\mathcal{I}$, the total facility cost and connection cost of $(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ are

$$\sum_i f_i^I \frac{y_i}{Z} \; and \; \sum_{j,A} p_A \cdot \frac{S_{j,A}}{r^{(1)}_{A,j}} \cdot \sum_i c_{ij} x^{(1)}_{A,ij}, \tag{4}$$

respectively. Next consider any scenario $A$, and construct a feasible fractional solution $(x', y')$ for $\mathcal{I}_A$. Let $r^2_{A,j} = \sum_i x^{(2)}_{A,ij}$. We may assume w.l.o.g that $r^2_{A,j} = 1 - r^1_{A,j}$. Thus, a necessary condition for $(j, A)$ not to be selected in first stage is

$$(1 - Z) \leq r^2_{A,j}. \tag{5}$$

This is analogous to (3), with $Z$ being replaced by $1 - Z$. Thus, we can argue similarly as we did for $(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ that $y'_i = min\{y_{A,i}/(1 - Z), 1\}$, $x'_{A,ij} = x^{(2)}_{A,ij}/r^{(2)}_{A,j}$ for all $(j, A)$ not selected in first stage, is a feasible fractional solution for $\mathcal{I}_A$. Since all demands here are unit, the total facility cost and connection cost of $x', y'$ are

$$\sum_i f_i^A \frac{y_{A,i}}{1 - Z} \; and \; \sum_{j,A} \frac{1 - S_{j,A}}{r^{(2)}_{A,j}} \cdot \sum_i c_{ij} x^{(2)}_{A,ij}, \tag{6}$$

respectively.

Since we have adopted the (1,2)-algorithm, the total final cost is

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 \cdot \Big(\sum_i f_i^I y_i E[1/Z] + \sum_A p_A f_i^A y_{A,i} \cdot E[1/(1 - Z)]\Big) \\ & \quad + 2 \cdot \Big(\sum_{j,A} p_A \cdot \frac{E[S_{j,A}]}{r^1_{j,A}} \cdot \sum_i c^1_{ij} x^{(1)}_{A,ij} + \sum_{j,A} p_A \cdot \frac{1 - E[S_{j,A}]}{r^2_{j,A}} \cdot \sum_i c^2_{ij} x^{(2)}_{A,ij}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

With the analysis similar to that of [13], and note that $Z$ and $1-Z$ have identical distributions, we have

$$E[Z] = E[1-Z] = \frac{2\alpha + \ln((1-\alpha)/\alpha)}{1-\alpha}. \tag{8}$$

$$E[S_{j,A}], E[1-S_{j,A}] \leq r^{(2)}_{A,j}/(1-\alpha). \tag{9}$$

Plugging (8), (9) into (7) and using the fact that $x_{A,ij} = x^{(1)}_{A,ij} + x^{(2)}_{A,ij}$, we see the approximation factor is

$$\max\{\frac{2\alpha + \ln((1-\alpha)/\alpha)}{1-\alpha}, \frac{2}{1-\alpha}\}. \tag{10}$$

**Theorem 1.** *There is a* $(\frac{2\alpha+\ln((1-\alpha)/\alpha)}{1-\alpha}, \frac{2}{1-\alpha})$*-approximation algorithm for The 2-Stage Stochastic Facility Location Problem With Different Connection Cost. Setting* $\alpha = 0.156$*, the approximation factor is* $2.370$.

By setting $c^1_{ij} = c^2_{ij}$, $\alpha = 0.3097$ and combing the above algorithm with the $(2.4061, 1.2707)$-algorithm in [3], i.e. with probability $p$ run the above algorithm, with complementary probability run the $(2.4061, 1.2707)$-algorithm, we have an improved approximation ratio 2.206 for TSFL.

**Theorem 2.** *There is a* $2.206$*-approximation algorithm for The 2-Stage Stochastic Facility Location Problem.*

With Lemma 2, 3 and 4, we have approximation algorithms for stochastic version for various facility location problems.

**Theorem 3.** *There is a* $(\frac{2\alpha+\ln((1-\alpha)/\alpha)}{1-\alpha}, \frac{2}{1-\alpha})$*-approximation algorithm for The 2-Stage Linear-Cost Facility Location Problem. Setting* $\alpha = 0.156$*, the approximation factor is* $2.370$.

**Remark 1.** *By carefully modifying the proofs and procedures, we can also adapt the* $(\gamma, 1 + \frac{2\gamma+2}{\gamma-2}e^{-\gamma})$*-algorithm in [3] to solve TSFLD. We could also combine this algorithm with the one used in this paper (with probability* $p$ *run the* $(\frac{2\alpha+\ln((1-\alpha)/\alpha)}{1-\alpha}, \frac{2}{1-\alpha})$*-approximation algorithm, with complementary probability run the* $(\gamma, 1 + \frac{2\gamma+2}{\gamma-2}e^{-\gamma})$*-algorithm) and achieve a better approximation ratio of* $2.328$ *by setting* $p = 0.7022$, $\alpha = 0.2257$*, and* $r = 2.6892$*. Hence The 2-Stage Linear-Cost Facility Location Problem can be approximated within a factor of* $2.328$*. However, it is not clear to the author that whether we could adapt the* $(2.4061, 1.2707)$*-algorithm in [3] to solve TSSCFL.*

In the case of soft-capacitated version, we set $Z = 1/2$ deterministically rather than retrieve it from some distribution and can easily adjust the analysis above to obtain a ratio of 4.

**Theorem 4.** *There is a* $4$*-approximation algorithm for The 2-Stage Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem.*

We also have

**Theorem 5.** *There is a* $(\max_{i\in\mathcal{F}} \frac{g_i(2)}{g_i(1)} \cdot \frac{2\alpha+\ln((1-\alpha)/\alpha)}{1-\alpha}, \frac{2}{1-\alpha})$*-approximation algorithm for The 2-Stage Concave Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem.*

It is worth to note that by simply setting $\gamma = 2.425$, we show that the algorithm from Byrka et al [3] in fact has a 2.425 per-scenario bound for the 2-stage stochastic facility location problem.

**Theorem 6.** *There is a* 2.425*-approximation algorithm for The 2-Stage Stochastic Facility Location Problem.*

# 4 The Robust Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem

We first show that a better analysis of the algorithm for RFTFL from Bryka et al [3] may render a approximation factor of $\alpha + 4$, which improves their result of $\alpha + 5 + 4/\alpha$. The key difference lies in the upper bound for the distance between client and the farthest facility.

The LP relaxation for RFTFL is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
Minimize \sum_{i\in\mathcal{F}} f_i y_i + \max_A \sum_j \sum_i c_{ij} x_{A,ij} & \\
s.t. \sum_i x_{A,ij} \geq 1 & \qquad \forall A \ \forall j; \\
x_{A,ij} \leq y_i & \qquad \forall i \ \forall A \ \forall j; \\
x_{A,ij} = 0 & \qquad \forall A \ \forall i \in A \ \forall j; \\
x_{A,ij}, y_i \geq 0 & \qquad \forall i \ \forall A \ \forall j.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $x_{A,ij}$ is the extent to which client $j$ is connected to facility $i$ if the scenario $A$ happens, i.e. the facilities in subset $A$ is closed by the adversary. $|A| \leq \alpha$, where $\alpha$ is the maximal number of facilities the adversary can close. Note that $A$ can be a subset of both opened and not opened facilities.

Let $(x^*, y^*)$ be an optimal fractional solution to the above relaxed LP. We scale it by a factor of $\gamma$, i.e. we set $\bar{y}_i = \min\{1, \gamma \cdot y_i^*\}$, $\bar{x}_{A,ij} = \min\{1, \gamma \cdot x^*_{A,ij}\}$. For a single client-scenario pair $(j, A)$, sort the facilities of which $x_{A,ij} > 0$ in nondecreasing order with respect to $c_{ij}$. Let $i$' be the first facility in this order such that $x^*_{A,i_1 j} + x^*_{A,i_2 j} + ... + x^*_{A,i' j} \geq \frac{\alpha+1}{\gamma}$. We split facilities when necessary to insure that $x^*_{A,i_1 j} + x^*_{A,i_2 j} + ... + x^*_{A,i' j} = \frac{\alpha+1}{\gamma}$. Note that $\sum_i x^*_{A,ij} = 1$ for every $j$ and $A$. Then we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 8.** *Also let* $C_{(j,A)} = \sum_i c_{ij} x^*_{A,ij}$ *denotes the fractional connection cost of client* $j$ *in scenario* $A$*. Then we have* $c_{i'j} \leq \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-\alpha-1} \cdot C_{(j,A)}$.

*Proof.* For a pair $(A, j)$, let $\mathcal{F}' = \{i^1, i^2, ..., i'\}$, then $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{F}\backslash\mathcal{F}'} x^*_{A,ij} = 1 - \frac{\alpha+1}{\gamma}$. For $i \in \mathcal{F}\backslash\mathcal{F}'$, we also have $c_{ij} \geq c_{i'j}$. So $C_{(j,A)} = \sum_i c_{ij} x^*_{A,ij} \geq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{F}\backslash\mathcal{F}'} c_{ij} x^*_{A,ij} \geq c_{i'j}(1 - \frac{\alpha+1}{\gamma})$. □

As in [3], the algorithm opens facility randomly as follows.

- If there exist $i$ among $i^1, i^2, ..., i'$ such that $\bar{y}_i = 1$. Then facility $i$ will be opened by probability 1. In this case $c_{ij} \leq c_{i'j} \leq \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-\alpha-1} \cdot C_{(j,A)}$.
- If there is no $i$ among $i^1, i^2, ..., i'$ such that $\bar{y}_i = 1$, then we round the facilities $i^1, i^2, ..., i'$ using the rounding scheme for *The Fault Tolerant Facility Location Problem* (cf, [4]), which turns $\alpha + 1$ fractional connections to facilities at distance at most $d$ into $\alpha + 1$ fractional connections to facilities at distance at most $3d$. Since at most $\alpha$ facilities will be closed by the adversary, there remains an open facility for client $j$ in scenario $A$ at distance at most $3 \cdot \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-\alpha-1} \cdot C_{(j,A)}$.

With the analysis above, it is clear that we have a $(\gamma, \frac{3\gamma}{\gamma-\alpha-1})$-approximation algorithm for RFTFL. Setting $\gamma = \alpha + 4$, the approximation ratio is $\alpha + 4$.

**Theorem 7.** *There is a* $(\alpha + 4)$*-approximation algorithm for The Robust Fault Tolerant Facility Location Problem, of which up to* $\alpha$ *facilities can be closed by the adversary.*

With Lemma 5, 6, 7, we have approximation algorithms for robust version of various facility location problems.

**Theorem 8.** *There is a* $(\gamma, \frac{3\gamma}{\gamma-\alpha-1})$*-approximation algorithm for The Robust Linear-Cost Facility Location Problem, of which up to* $\alpha$ *facilities can be closed by the adversary. Setting* $\gamma = \alpha + 4$*, the approximation ratio is* $\alpha + 4$.

**Theorem 9.** *There is a* $(2\gamma, \frac{3\gamma}{\gamma-\alpha-1})$*-approximation algorithm for The Robust Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem, of which up to* $\alpha$ *facilities can be closed by the adversary. Setting* $\gamma = \alpha + 5/2$*, the approximation ratio is* $2\alpha + 5$.

**Theorem 10.** *There is a* $(\max_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{g_i(2)}{g_i(1)} \gamma, \frac{3\gamma}{\gamma-\alpha-1})$*-approximation algorithm for The Robust Concave Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem, of which up to* $\alpha$ *facilities can be closed by the adversary.*

# 5 Concluding Remark

In this paper we have proposed and better analyzed several stochastic and robust facility location problems. There are relatively very few efforts devoted to designing approximation algorithms to solve combinatorial problems with uncertainty either stochastically or robustly. Incorporating uncertainty into combinatorial problems is a vital way to make these classic models more "practical". Approximation algorithms may also become more influential in areas like engineering or operations research if they are used to solve more realistic problems and have good performances. We believe this trend will become more prominent in the future.

# References

[1] V. Arya, N. Garg, R. Khandekar, A. Meyerson, K. Munagala, and V. Pandit, *Local search heuristics for k-median and facility location problems*, Proceedings of 33rd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 2001.

[2] P. Bauer and R. Enders, *A capacitated facility location problem with integer decision variables*, International Symposium on Mathematical Programming (ISMP), 1997.

[3] J. Byrka, M. R. Ghodsi, and A. Srinivasan, *LP-rounding algorithms for facility-location problems*, CoRR (2010).

[4] J. Byrka, A. Srinivasan, and C. Swamy, *Fault-tolerant facility location: a randomized dependent LP-rounding algorithm*, IPCO, 2010, pp. 244–257.

[5] S. Chechik and D. Peleg, *Robust fault tolerant uncapacitated facility location*, STACS, 2010, pp. 191–202.

[6] F.A. Chudak and D. Shmoys, *Improved approximation algorithms for the capacitated facility location problem.*, Proc. 10th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, 1999, pp. 875–876.

[7] K. Jain, M. Mahdian, and A. Saberi, *A new greedy approach for facility location problems*, Proceedings of the Thiry-fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2002, ACM, New York, 2002, pp. 731–740.

[8] K. Jain and V.V. Vazirani, *Approximation algorithms for metric facility location and k-median problems using the primal-dual schema and lagrangian relaxation*, Journal of the ACM **48** (2001), 274–296.

[9] Y. Li, D. Xu, D. Du, and N. Xiu, *Improved approximation algorithms for the robustfault-tolerantfacility location problem*, Information Processing Letters **112** (2012), 361–364.

[10] M. Mahdian, Y. Ye, and J. Zhang, *A 2-approximation algorithm for the softcapacitated facility location problem*, RANDOM 2003 and APPROX 2003. LNCS (J.D.P. Rolim A. Sahai S. Arora, K. Jansen, ed.), vol. 2764, 2003, pp. 129–140.

[11] ———, *Approximation algorithms for metric facility location problems*, SIAM J. Comput. **36** (2006), no. 2, 411–432.

[12] L. Snyder, *Facility location under uncertainty: a review*, IIE Transactions **38** (2007), 547–564.

[13] A. Srinivasan, *Approximation algorithms for stochastic and risk-averse optimization*, In Proceedings of the 18th SODA, 2007, pp. 1305–1313.

[14] M. Sviridenko, *An improved approximation algorithm for the metric uncapacitated facility location problem*, IPCO, 2002, pp. 240–257.

[15] C. Swamy, *Approximation algorithms for clustering problems*, Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 2004.

[16] C. Swamy and D. B. Shmoys, *Sampling-based approximation algorithms for multi-stage stochastic optimization*, FOCS, 2005, pp. 357–366.